

### III. RECOMMENDED ORGANIZATION OF AN INTEGRATED REPORT

As states transition from reporting water quality results under separate documents (e.g., section 305(b) reports and section 303(d) lists) to reporting under a single Integrated Report (IR), it would be helpful to use a common organizational structure and method of reporting water quality results so that members of the public can more easily review reports and lists from different states. EPA's recommended organization for states' Integrated Report submittals is provided in Exhibit 3-1.

An annotated version of Exhibit 3-1 constitutes the remainder of Section III. The recommended structure and content for an IR are based, in large part, on EPA's 1997 guidelines<sup>4</sup> for CWA section 305(b) reports. Hence, states should consult EPA's 1997 guidelines for further details when needed.

The recommended organization provided in Section III also highlights what reporting elements are required by sections 303(d), 305(b), 314, and corresponding regulations (as discussed in Section II), versus those elements that are recommended. A summary of which elements of EPA's recommended organization for an Integrated Report are required versus recommended is provided Table 3-11 at the end of this section.

#### Exhibit 3-1 Recommended Organization for Year 2006 Integrated Report Submittals

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
PART A.	INTRODUCTION
PART B.	BACKGROUND
	B1. Total Waters
	B2. Water Pollution Control Program
	B3. Cost/Benefit Assessment
	B4. Special State Concerns and Recommendations
PART C.	SURFACE WATER MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT
	C1. Monitoring Program
	C2. Assessment Methodology
	C3. Assessment Results
	C4. Wetlands Program
	C5. Trends Analysis for Surface Waters
	C6. Public Health Issues
PART D.	GROUND WATER MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT
PART E.	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

<sup>4</sup> Guidelines for Preparation of the Comprehensive State Water Quality Assessments (305(b) Reports) and Electronic Updates: Report Contents; Office of Water, US EPA; EPA-841-B-97-002a, September 1997.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Executive Summary should highlight the report's major points of information, conclusions and recommendation. States should include in this section a summary of the overall water quality (surface water and ground water) in the state, description of the causes and sources of water quality impairments, summary of the plan showing how the state will achieve comprehensive coverage of its waters, discussion of the programs to correct impairments and discussion of the general changes or trends in water quality.

In the summary of overall water quality status for surface waters, states may include the tables requested in Section C.3 (Assessment Results). States are also encouraged to include in this section summary maps that depict water quality status information.

## **PART A. INTRODUCTION**

The Introduction should include a narrative discussion that defines the purpose and contents of the 2006 Integrated Report. The Introduction may include a rationale for why the state has chosen to streamline its reporting of water quality status (i.e., the results of placing segments into the five categories) and trends. The state may choose to explain why the use of this new reporting format will serve as a better mechanism to integrate CWA sections 303(d), 305(b), and 314 efforts in the state. The state may also choose to discuss how this integrated reporting format will clarify the complementary roles of predictive tools (e.g., probability-based monitoring designs, models, and remote-sensing) and site-specific monitoring to assess water quality conditions.

States may also describe in the Introduction how they are ensuring the development of an integrated database of assessment information that reflects the status of water quality standards attainment. Specifically, the Introduction may discuss how the state may increase the amount of assessment information that is geo-referenced and transmitted electronically through the ADB or a compatible data exchange format.

## **PART B. BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The Background section should include a description of total waters in the state, a description of the state's water pollution control program, a cost/benefit analysis of actions necessary to achieve the objective of the CWA, and any special state concerns and recommendations.

### **B.1 Scope of Waters in the Integrated Report**

To put the report into perspective for the reader, the state should provide a brief water resource overview (as shown in Table 3-1) of all waters<sup>5</sup> in the state. States are also encouraged to include summary maps of water resource information in this subsection.

---

<sup>5</sup> "Waters of the United States" as defined in 40 CFR 122.2.

**Table 3-1. Atlas**

<b>Topic<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Scale<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Source<sup>c</sup></b>
State Population		N/A	N/A
Total Miles of River and Streams . Miles of perennial rivers/streams (subset) . Miles of intermittent (nonperennial) streams (subset) . Miles of ditches and canals (subset) . Border miles of shared rivers/streams (subset)			
Number of lakes/reservoirs/ponds <sup>d</sup> . Number of significant publicly owned lakes/reservoirs/ponds (subset)			
Acres of lakes/reservoirs/ponds . Acres of significant publicly owned lakes/reservoir/ponds (subset)			
Square Miles of estuaries/harbors/bays			
Miles of Ocean Coast			
Acres of Freshwater Wetlands			
Acres of Tidal Wetlands			

Notes:

N/A Not applicable

- <sup>a</sup> State may add categories to the atlas table to reflect special areas of interest (such as, acres of playas; acres of riparian areas outside of wetlands; and miles of streams and acres of lakes on Tribal lands).
- <sup>b</sup> State should specify the scale (e.g., 1:100,000; 1:24,000) in this column.
- <sup>c</sup> State should specify the source (e.g., NHD, USGS quad maps, state inventory) in this column.
- <sup>d</sup> Impoundments should be classified according to their hydrologic behavior, either as stream channel miles under rivers or as total surface acreage under lakes/reservoirs/ponds, but not under both categories. In general, impoundments should be reported as lakes/reservoirs/ponds unless they are run-of-river impoundments with very short retention times.

Please note, most of the tables in this section ask states to report on the extent, or size of waters. To clarify the source of these measurements, states should include in this subsection a description of the process used to make measurements of waters in the state. To promote national consistency in measurement and reporting, EPA recommends the use of the National Hydrography Dataset (NHD), which currently supports measurements at the 1:100,000 scale. Additional information on the NHD is available at [www.epa.gov/owow/monitoring/georef/nhd.htm](http://www.epa.gov/owow/monitoring/georef/nhd.htm). EPA notes that many states are now making measurements at the 1:24,000 scale. Therefore, for purposes of reporting measurements in the Integrated Report, EPA asks that states indicate the scale at which the measurements were made.

## **B.2 Water Pollution Control Program**

The state should provide a description of its approach to water quality management, including overviews of any watershed-based programs; the WQSS program; the point source control program; the nonpoint source control program; the TMDL program, and; program coordination with other state, tribal, and local agencies. States may also choose to highlight atmospheric deposition reduction strategies in this subsection. As shown in Table 2-1, CWA section 305(b) and EPA's implementing regulations require states to provide the following information about their water pollution control programs:

- *An estimate of the extent to which CWA control programs have improved water quality or will improve water quality, and recommendations for future actions necessary and identifications of waters needing action.*
- *A description of the nature and extent of nonpoint source pollution and recommendations of programs needed to control each category of nonpoint sources, including an estimate of implementation costs.*

## **B.3 Cost/Benefit Assessment**

As shown in Table 2-1, CWA section 305(b) (and associated regulations) also requires states to provide an *estimate of the environmental, economic and social costs and benefits needed to achieve the objectives of the CWA and an estimate of the date of such achievement*. EPA recognizes that this information may be difficult to obtain due to the complexities of the economic analysis involved. Until such time as comparable procedures for evaluation costs and benefits are in wider use, states should provide a brief narrative that includes as much of the following information as possible.

For costs, EPA asks that states provide information on capital investments in municipal and industrial facilities, investments in nonpoint source measures, annual operation and maintenance costs of municipal and industrial facilities, total annual costs of municipal and industrial facilities, and annual costs to states and local governments to administer water pollution control activities.

For benefits, EPA asks that states provide information on improvements in recreational and commercial fishing; extent of stream miles, lakes acres, etc., improved from impaired to meeting WQSS; reduced costs of drinking water treatment due to cleaner intake water; and increase in use of beaches and recreational boating due to improved water quality.

## **B.4 Special State Concerns and Recommendations**

In this subsection, states should (1) discuss special concerns that are significant issues within the state and that affect its water quality programs and (2) provide recommendations for actions that are necessary to achieve the objectives of the CWA.

## **PART C. SURFACE WATER MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT**

The Surface Water Monitoring and Assessment section should include a description of the state's monitoring program, a description of the assessment methodology for classifying all surface waters, assessment results, a description of the state's wetlands program, an analysis of surface water quality trends, and information on public health issues.

### **C.1 Monitoring Program**

This subsection should include a description (or reference applicable documents) of the following elements of the state's monitoring program:

- Monitoring Program Strategy
- Monitoring Objectives
- Monitoring Design
- Core and Supplemental Indicators
- Quality Assurance
- Data Management
- Data Analysis/Assessment
- Reporting
- Programmatic Evaluation
- General Support and Infrastructure Planning

EPA expects that states will develop, over time, a monitoring program that addresses the 10 elements listed above. The first of these elements (monitoring program strategy) is currently under development by states and will include a timeline to complete implementation of all 10 elements by 2014. Additional guidance on these elements is available in EPA's Elements of a State Water Monitoring and Assessment Program (US EPA, Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds; EPA 841-B-03-003; March 2003).

As shown in Table 2-1, CWA section 305(b) and EPA's implementing regulations require states to provide a *description of the water quality of all waters<sup>6</sup> in the States and the extent to which the quality of waters provides for the protection and propagation of a balanced population of shellfish, fish, and wildlife and allows recreational activities in and on the water*. As a result, EPA and the states have established a long-term goal of comprehensively characterizing surface waters of each state using a variety of techniques. These techniques may include traditional targeted monitoring, probability-based monitoring surveys, targeted site-specific monitoring, landscape and water quality models, and remote sensing. States should include a description of their approach to comprehensive assessment in this subsection.

---

<sup>6</sup> "Waters of the United States" as defined in 40 CFR 122.2.

States should also include in this subsection a schedule that identifies the waters that will be monitored and assessed during the next two-year reporting cycle. If this information is included in other documents, such as the state's section 106 workplan or a Performance Partnership Grant (PPG), the state may provide a reference to that document. EPA does not expect that all waters will be scheduled for monitoring during the next two-year reporting cycle. This short-term monitoring schedule should be consistent with the state's monitoring priorities. The short-term monitoring schedule may present upcoming monitoring activities planned under the long-term strategy, including the use of probability-based monitoring, landscape and water quality models, and targeted monitoring to predict and verify water quality conditions. EPA intends that the monitoring schedule will inform stakeholders and EPA of a state's upcoming monitoring activities and will help promote collaboration and coordination among monitoring organizations.

## **C.2 Assessment Methodology**

This subsection should include a description (or reference applicable documents) of the state's methodology for assessing the water quality attainment status of all waters<sup>7</sup> in the state. The assessment methodology should be consistent with the state's WQSs and include a description of the following as part of their section 303(d) list submissions:

- What data and information were used to make attainment determinations (e.g., results from site-specific and probabilistic monitoring and other predictive tools);
- How the data and information were used to make attainment determinations and place surface water segments in the five reporting categories;
- Rationales for any decision to not use any existing and readily available data and information;
- Changes in the assessment methodology since the last reporting cycle.

Assessment methodologies that include the information listed above also satisfy the state's requirements under CWA section 303(d) (and associated regulations) to provide the following information as shown in Table 2-1: (1) *a description of the methodology used to develop the section 303(d) list*, (2) *a description of the data and information used to identify [impaired and threatened] waters, including a description of the existing and readily available data and information used*, and (3) *a rationale for any decision to not use any existing and readily available data and information*<sup>8</sup>.

EPA also encourages states to make the assessment methodology available to the public for review and comment. Hence, states are encouraged to provide a description of the public participation process for the IR in this section, or reference their CPP as appropriate. Additional information on development/use of an assessment methodology and EPA's five reporting categories is provided in Sections IV and V of this guidance, respectively.

---

<sup>7</sup> "Waters of the United States" as defined in 40 CFR 122.2.

<sup>8</sup> Although a description of the state's assessment methodology is required, EPA does not approve or disapprove the assessment methodology under CWA section 303(d).

### C.3 Assessment Results

This subsection should present the results of the state's surface water assessments, including the five-part categorization of all surface water segments, probability-based survey results, the section 303(d) list, and State-level summaries of designated use support. In addition, states should satisfy CWA section 314 (Lakes Program) reporting requirements in this subsection.

States should attempt to manage their assessment results in the Assessment Database (ADB) or a compatible data management system and submit them electronically with the Integrated Report. That system should provide the supporting information for this section. The summary tables provided in this section can be generated directly out of the ADB and inserted into any word processing document.

Additional information on these reporting elements is provided below. How states organize the presentation of their assessment results in hard-copy format is left to their discretion. For example, states could organize their assessment results by the reporting elements italicized below, or by waterbody type (e.g., rivers/streams, lakes/ponds, estuaries/oceans, and wetlands).

#### *Five-Part Categorization of Surface Waters*

States should assign all of their surface water segments to one or more of the five reporting categories presented in Section V of this guidance. States should also include a summary of the extent of surface waters assigned to each reporting category as shown in Table 3-2.

**Table 3-2. Size<sup>a</sup> of Surface Waters Assigned to Reporting Categories**

Waterbody Type	Category							Total in State	Total Assessed
	1	2	3	4a	4b	4c	5		
River/stream miles									
Lake/pond acres									
Estuarine square miles									
Ocean coast miles									
Freshwater wetland									
Tidal wetland acres									

Note:

- <sup>a</sup> For states that place surface water segments in more than one reporting category, the summation of the size of surface water segments assigned to the five reporting categories will be greater than the "Total in State" summation for each waterbody type. In such cases, EPA recommends that states provide a statement in the IR that clarifies the discrepancy.

#### *Results of Probability-based Surveys*

States should report the results of probability-based surveys as shown in Table 3-3. EPA is working on a supplemental module to the ADB for transmitting the results of probability-based surveys. Reporting the results is particularly important because probability-based surveys allow states to report on the condition of the entire population of surface waters (e.g., coastal waters, rivers and streams, estuaries, etc.) included in the design. Site-specific assessment results will not result in an assessment of all surface waters, unless the state is able to implement a census.

**Table 3-3. Attainment Results Calculated Using Probabilistic Monitoring Designs**

<b>Project ID</b>	STX_1	
<b>Project Name</b>	Downstate Sample Survey	
<b>Target Population</b>	All streams ordered 4 or greater in basins C and D	
<b>Type of Waterbody</b>	River	
<b>Size of Target Population</b>	100	
<b>Units of Measurement</b>	Miles	
<b>Designated_use</b>	Aquatic life	
<b>Percent_attaining</b>	75%	
<b>Percent_not_attaining</b>	23%	
<b>Percent nonresponse</b>	2%	
<b>Indicator</b>	Biological	
<b>Assmt_date</b>	20000201	
<b>Precision</b>	90%	

***Section 303(d) List***

As shown in Table 2-1, The Clean Water Act and EPA regulations require states to submit the following information as part of their section 303(d) list submission:

- *A list of water quality-limited (impaired and threatened) waters still requiring TMDL(s) [waters assigned to Category 5], pollutants causing the impairment, and priority ranking for TMDL development (including waters targeted for TMDL development within the next two years).*
- *Any other reasonable information requested by EPA, such as demonstrating good cause for not including a water or waters on the list.*

Although states are not required to provide “good cause” for each delisting prior to receiving a formal request from EPA, EPA recommends that states do so in the IR. States should highlight in this subsection those segment/pollutant combinations that have been either added or removed since the last reporting cycle and summary rationales (“good cause”) for each delisting. Table 3-4 provides a recommended format for summarizing delisting rationales in this subsection. States should provide detailed rationales for removing segment/pollutant combinations from their previous 303(d) lists in the record of decision for the list.

States may also report on the status of their TMDL development by providing information such as that found in Table 3-5 in this subsection or in the discussion of their Water Pollution Control Program (Section B.2).



**Table 3-4. Segment/Pollutant Combinations Removed from State's Year 2004 Section 303(d) List**

<b>Segment/ Pollutant Combination on Year 2004 Section 303(d) List</b>	<b>Segment (Waterbody) ID</b>	<b>Summary<sup>a</sup> Rationale for Delisting of Segment/Pollutant Combinations</b> <i>(identify number of reason)</i> 1. State determines water quality standard is being met 2. Flaws in original listing 3. Other point source or nonpoint source controls are expected to meet water quality standards 4. Impairment due to non-pollutant 5. EPA approval of TMDL 6. Waterbody not in state's jurisdiction 7. Other

Note:

- <sup>a</sup> Detailed justifications for removing waters from previous section 303(d) list should be provided in the record of decision for the listing cycle in which the state proposes the water for removal.

**Table 3-5. TMDL Development Status**

<b>Segment/Pollutant Combination</b>	<b>Segment ID</b>	<b>Project Status<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Projected TMDL Submittal Date</b>

Note:

- <sup>a</sup> Under project status, states may provide a brief description of the status of TMDL development. This could be done by providing a 1 or 2 word description of status (e.g., "completed", "in draft") or by providing a more extensive description of status. For example, states may elect to include information on whether the TMDL is being developed under court order deadline, whether supplemental monitoring is being performed, and when public meetings are scheduled to be held.

### ***State Summaries of Designated Use Support***

The state should provide designated use support summaries for each waterbody type, as shown in Table 3-6. States should include values for applicable designated use categories such as aquatic life, fish consumption, shellfishing, swimming, secondary contact, drinking water, agricultural, cultural ceremonial, etc.

EPA recognizes that states may have site-specific results, as well as results of probability survey(s) that could be used to generate these results. When information from state-wide probability surveys is available, that information should be used to complete Table 3-6 for the appropriate waterbody type/use combination. Site-specific information should be used to provide designated use summaries for waterbody types where probability-results are not available or to complement the results of probability-results that are not state-wide in scope. It is important that the state indicate whether the state-wide numbers in Table 3-6 were generated via probability or site-specific surveys. In addition, states that report results based on probability surveys should complete Table 3-3 to provide additional information. States should also include state-level summaries of causes and sources (when possible) of impaired waters as shown in Tables 3-7 and 3-8, respectively.

**Table 3-6. Individual Designated Use Support Summary** *(One Table for Each Waterbody Type)*

Designated Use	Size of Surface Waters				
	Total in State	Total Assessed	Supporting – Attaining WQ Standards	Not Supporting – Not Attaining WQ Standards	Insufficient Data and Information
Aquatic Life State Defined 1. 2.					
Fish Consumption Shellfishing Swimming Secondary Contact Drinking Water State Defined 1. 2.					
Agricultural Industrial Cultural or Ceremonial State Defined 1. 2.					

**Table 3-7. Size of Waters Impaired by Causes** *(One Table for Each Waterbody Type)*

Cause/Impairment Type (Examples <sup>a</sup> ) from ADB	Size of Waters Impaired
Ammonia (unionized)	
Cause/Stressor Unknown	
Chlorophyll a	
Copper	
Escherichia coli	
Mercury	
pH	
Phosphorus	
Turbidity	
Etc.	

Notes:

<sup>a</sup> The parameters identified in this table are used as examples only. Please refer to the complete list of causes available for reporting at <http://www.epa.gov/waters/adb/>

**Table 3-8. Size of Waters Impaired by Sources** *(One Table for Each Waterbody Type)*

Source Category (Examples <sup>a</sup> ) from ADB	Size of Surface Waters Impaired
Industrial Point Sources	
Municipal Point Sources	
Combined Sewer Overflows	
Urban Runoff/Storm Sewers	
Agriculture	
Crop production	
Rangeland grazing	
Hydromodification	
Atmospheric Deposition	
Unknown Source	
Etc.	

Notes:

<sup>a</sup> The parameters identified in this table are used as examples only. Please refer to the complete list of sources available for reporting at <http://www.epa.gov/waters/adb/>

**CWA Section 314 (Clean Lakes Program)**

As shown in Table 2-1, states are required to submit the following information about the status of publicly owned lakes:

1. *An identification and classification according to eutrophic condition of all publicly owned lakes in such state.*
2. *A description of procedures, processes, and methods (including land use requirements), to control sources of pollution of such lakes*
3. *A description of methods and procedures, in conjunction with appropriate federal agencies, to restore the quality of such lakes*
4. *Methods and procedures to mitigate the harmful effects of high acidity, including innovative methods of neutralizing and restoring buffering capacity of lakes and methods of removing from lakes toxic metals and other toxic substances mobilized by high acidity*
5. *A list and description of those publicly owned lakes in such state for which uses are known to be impaired, including those lakes which are known not to meet applicable water quality standards or which require implementation of control programs to maintain compliance with applicable standards and those lakes in which water quality has deteriorated as a result of high acidity that may reasonably be due to acid deposition*
6. *An assessment of the status and trends of water quality in lakes in such state, including but not limited to, the nature and extent of pollution loading from point and nonpoint sources and the extent to which the use of lakes is impaired as a result of such pollution, particularly with respect to toxic pollution.*

Table 3-9 provides a recommended format for reporting on the trophic status of significant publicly owned lakes. States satisfy the requirement to provide a list of publicly owned lakes that are known to be impaired by placing such waters in Category 5 and including them on the section 303(d) list. Table 3-10 provides a recommended format for reporting on trends in lake water quality. States may satisfy the requirement to provide a trend analysis of water quality in lakes in this subsection or in Trend Analysis for Surface Waters (Section C.5).

**Table 3-9. Trophic Status of Significant Publicly Owned Lakes**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Number of Lakes</b>	<b>Acres of Lakes</b>
Total in state		
Assessed		
Oligotrophic		
Mesotrophic		
Eutrophic		
Hypereutrophic		
Dystrophic		
Unknown		

**Table 3-10. Trends in Lake Water Quality**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Number of Lakes</b>	<b>Acres of Lakes</b>
Assessed For Trends		
Improving		
Stable		
Degrading		
Fluctuating		
Trend unknown		

#### **C.4 Wetlands Program**

States may dedicate a section of their Integrated Report to providing a description of their wetlands program if not already covered in another section of the Report. This section could include information on development of wetland water quality standards, extent of wetland resources, integrity of wetlands resources, and wetland protection activities.

#### **C.5 Trend Analysis for Surface Waters**

As discussed in Section C.3, states are required under CWA section 314 to report on lake water quality trends. In addition to lake trends, states may also report on water quality trends for other surface waters in this section of the Integrated Report. To enhance states' and EPA's capability to perform water quality trend analyses, states should routinely and comprehensively update STORET and ADB (or compatible electronic data format).

## C.6 Public Health Issues

In this subsection, states should provide information on public health issues, including information on their programs related to drinking water supplies, beach use, and fish/shellfish advisories. For drinking water programs, states should highlight the following information:

1. Total miles of rivers/streams and acres of lakes/reservoirs designated for drinking water use.
2. For waters designated for drinking water use, miles of rivers/streams and acres of lakes/reservoirs assigned to each of the five reporting categories.
3. Summary of the methodologies used to perform drinking water use assessments under the Clean Water Act, including the contaminants chosen for assessment and the rationale for their selection. Note, states may reference their assessment methodology for this information.
4. Identification and extent of impaired miles of rivers/streams and impaired acres of lakes/reservoirs that overlap source water areas of community water systems as delineated by states under SDWA section 1453.

States should consult Section 4, Chapter 8 (*Public Water Supply/ Drinking Water Use Reporting*) EPA's 1997 guidelines<sup>9</sup> for further details on reporting in this subsection.

## PART D. GROUND WATER MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT

As discussed in Section II of this guidance, for states to be eligible for section 106 grant funds, section 106(e)(1) requires that states must have the means to monitor water quality (including “navigable waters and to the extent practicable, ground waters”) and annually update water quality data and include it in their section 305(b) submittals. In this section, states should include a summary of their ground water monitoring and protection programs, ground water quality, ground water contamination sources, and ground water/surface water interactions. States should consult Section 5 (*Ground Water Assessment*) EPA's 1997 guidelines<sup>10</sup> for further details on reporting ground-water monitoring data.

## PART E. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

EPA regulations require states to describe in their Continuing Planning Processes (CPP) the process for involving the public and other stakeholders in the development of the section 303(d) list (40 CFR 130.7(a)). EPA encourages the state to provide opportunities for public participation in the development of the Integrated Report and demonstrate how it considered public comments in its final decisions.

States should respond to commenters by including a responsiveness summary in their Integrated Reports or by making the summary available by other means used by the state (e.g., internet posting, mailing to commenters). States should submit or make available to EPA at the time of the Integrated Report submittal a copy of all comment letters, e-mail, etc., received from the public and a responsiveness summary addressing all comments. The responses should provide enough detail to clearly explain how

---

<sup>9</sup> Guidelines for Preparation of the Comprehensive State Water Quality Assessments (305(b) Reports) and Electronic Updates: Report Contents; Office of Water, US EPA; EPA-841-B-97-002a, September 1997.

<sup>10</sup> Guidelines for Preparation of the Comprehensive State Water Quality Assessments (305(b) Reports) and Electronic Updates: Report Contents; Office of Water, US EPA; EPA-841-B-97-002a, September 1997.

the state considered the comment and whether and how the placement of waters in the five categories changed in response to the comment.

If the state received comments on a particular issue that opposes or questions the state's decisions, the Regions should determine whether those comments are adequately addressed in the state's comment response document. If the Region agrees with the state's substantive decision, but believes that the state's comment response is inadequate, the Region can work with the state to supplement its response even after the formal submission is made (but prior to the Region's approval or disapproval action). If the state is unwilling or unable to supplement the state's responses, the Region should address the issue in its decision document or elsewhere in the administrative record.

Table 3-11. Summary of Water Quality Reporting Elements of an Integrated Report

Reporting Element	Required <sup>a</sup> (●) Versus Recommended (○)
<b>Executive Summary</b>	○
<b>Part A. Introduction</b>	○
<b>Part B. Background Information</b>	
<b>B.1 Total Waters</b>	○
<b>B.2 Water Pollution Control Program</b>	See below
<i>Description of water quality management program</i>	○
<i>An estimate of the extent to which CWA control programs have improved water quality or will improve water quality, and recommendations for future actions necessary and identifications of waters needing action.</i>	●
<i>A description of the nature and extent of nonpoint source pollution and recommendations of programs needed to control each category of nonpoint sources, including an estimate of implementation costs.</i>	●
<b>B.3 Cost/Benefit Analysis</b>	●
<b>B.4 Special State Concerns and Recommendations</b>	○
<b>Part C. Surface Water Monitoring and Assessment</b>	
<b>C.1 Monitoring Program</b>	○
<b>C.2 Assessment Methodology</b>	See below
<i>Description of data and information was used to make attainment determinations</i>	●
<i>Description of how the data and information was used to make attainment determinations</i>	●
<i>Rationales for any decision to not use any existing and readily available data and information.</i>	●
<i>Description of changes in the assessment methodology since the last reporting cycle</i>	○
<b>C.3 Assessment Results</b>	● <sup>b</sup> (See below)
<i>Assessment Database (ADB)<sup>c</sup> and georeferencing information</i>	○
<i>Five-part categorization of waters</i>	○
<i>Results of Probability-based designs</i>	○
<i>303(d) list: list of water quality-limited (impaired and threatened) waters still requiring TMDL(s) [waters assigned to Category 5], pollutants causing the impairment and priority ranking for TMDL development (including waters targeted for TMDL development within the next 2 years).</i>	●
<i>Changes from previous 303(d) list (i.e., the water/pollutants that have been added and the water/pollutants that have been delisted and the reason for their delisting)</i>	○

Reporting Element	Required <sup>a</sup> (●) Versus Recommended (○)
<i>Status of TMDL development</i>	○
<i>State summaries of designated use support</i>	○
<i>Eutrophic condition of all publicly owned lakes in such State</i>	○
<i>A description of procedures used to control pollution and restore water quality</i>	○
<i>Methods used to mitigate high acidity in lakes</i>	●
<i>A list and description of those publicly owned lakes in such State for which uses are known to be impaired and those lakes in which water quality has deteriorated as a result of high acidity that may reasonably be due to acid deposition</i>	●
<i>An assessment of the status and trends of water quality in lakes</i>	●
<b>C.4 Wetland Program</b>	○
<b>C.5 Trends Analysis</b>	○
<b>C.6 Public Health Issues</b>	○
<b>Part D. Ground Water Monitoring &amp; Assessment</b>	○
<b>Part E. Public Participation</b>	See below
<i>Description of public participation process</i>	○
<i>Copy of all comment letters, e-mail, etc., received from the public and a responsiveness summary</i>	○

Notes:

<sup>a</sup> Required by Clean Water Act sections 303(d), 305(b) or 314 and their corresponding regulations.

<sup>b</sup> CWA section 305(b) requires states to provide a description of the water quality of all waters in their state. As a result, EPA and the states have established a long-term goal of comprehensively characterizing surface waters of each state using a variety of techniques. These techniques may include traditional targeted monitoring, probability-based monitoring surveys, targeted site-specific monitoring, landscape and water quality modeling, and remote sensing.

<sup>c</sup> EPA strongly encourages all states to use the ADB. If the state is not using the ADB, this assessment unit specific information should be submitted in a compatible electronic system. The state should work with EPA to ensure that the electronic assessment information submitted can be compiled by EPA for regional and national reporting and can be sorted into the five part list as outlined in the IR guidance.